

Appl. No. : 10/764,012
Filed : January 23, 2004

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing a telephonic interview to occur on June 30, 2006.

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1 and 5 were discussed during the interview.

Proposed Amendments & Support

Applicant proposed that Claim 5 be amended to reflect the language as it was originally filed to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

Applicant pointed out that an amendment to the specification was necessary as a statement regarding the flexibility and rigidity of the polyols was mistakenly reversed. This mistake had been incorporated into the claims and therefore an amendment to the claims is necessary as well. Support for such an amendment is supported by the Examples. Furthermore, Applicant proposed that Claim 1 be amended to further clarify that a hypothetical polyurethane formed by the reaction of the one or more monomeric or oligomeric poly- or di-isocyanates and the first polyol, in the absence of the second polyol, have the corrected rigidity,

Results of Interview

The Examiner agreed that the switch of the flexible and rigid polyols would probably not be new matter so long it was support in the specification by the Examples. The Examiner also agreed that the proposed amendment to Claim 5 would overcome the outstanding 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.